## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MARCUS ODOM,

Movant.

20-CV-0010 (JMF)

-against-

17-CR-0321 (JMF)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

ORDER TO ANSWER, 28 U.S.C. § 2255

Respondent.

JESSE M. FURMAN, United States District Judge:

The Court, having concluded that the motion brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 should not be summarily dismissed as being without merit, hereby ORDERS that:

The Clerk of Court shall electronically notify the Criminal Division of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York that this order has been issued.

Within sixty days of the date of this order, the U.S. Attorney's Office shall file an answer or other pleadings in response to the motion. Movant shall have thirty days from the date on which Movant is served with Respondent's answer to file a response. Absent further order, the motion will be considered fully submitted as of that date.

All further papers filed or submitted for filing must include the criminal docket number and will be docketed in the criminal case.

Finally, Movant fails to demonstrate that the "interests of justice" call for the appointment of counsel. *See* ECF No. 1. Thus, Movant's motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED without prejudice to renewal at the time of his response to Respondent's answer.

Because Movant has not at this time made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, a certificate of appealability will not issue. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253.

2

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Cf. Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 21, 2020

New York, New York

JESSE M. FURMAN United States District Judge